

# SYMMETRIES, SUPERSELECTION RULES, AND DECOHERENCE

**D. Giulini<sup>1</sup> and C. Kiefer**

Fakultät für Physik, Universität Freiburg,  
Hermann-Herder-Str. 3, D-79104 Freiburg, Germany.

**H. D. Zeh**

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Heidelberg,  
Philosophenweg 19, D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany.

## Abstract

We discuss the applicability of the programme of decoherence – emergence of approximate classical behaviour through interaction with the environment – to cases where it was suggested that the presence of symmetries would lead to exact superselection rules. For this discussion it is useful to make a distinction between pure symmetries and redundancies, which results from an investigation into the constraint equations of the corresponding theories. We discuss, in particular, superpositions of states with different charges, as well as with different masses, and suggest how the corresponding interference terms, although they exist in principle, become inaccessible through decoherence.

*Submitted to Physics Letters A*

---

<sup>1</sup>Present address: Center for Gravitational Physics and Geometry, The Pennsylvania State University, 104 Davey Laboratory, University Park, PA 16802-6300.

It is evident that most superpositions of quantum states do not seem to be realised in Nature, although they would be allowed by the *linearity* of quantum mechanics. Familiar examples are the apparent absence of superpositions for macroscopic bodies being at different places, or of superpositions of states with different charges, among many others. This fact led, in the past, to the introduction of “superselection rules” which seem to *forbid* the occurrence of such superpositions in an ad hoc manner [1]. A postulate, of course, does not yet provide an explanation, and the question arose about the possible derivability of such superselection rules. From an inspection of algebraic field theory texts one can get the impression that some of these rules can, under certain assumptions, be derived rigorously, see e.g.[2, 3]. On the other hand, it has been shown in a wide range of examples that the influence of the natural environment to a given system generally leads to the delocalisation of phase relations and thus gives rise to the classical appearance of the system. This mechanism of *decoherence* occurs naturally and is an ubiquitous phenomenon [4, 5].

There remain, however, still a few examples where superselection rules seem to hold exactly. They are connected with the presence of *symmetries* – well known examples are the superselection rules for charge, mass (in the nonrelativistic case), or for particles with different spin. The question now arises whether it is possible also to explain *these* superselection rules as an effect of the correlation with the environment. An affirmative answer would demonstrate that the universality of the superposition principle could be maintained. In our Letter we shall put forward the point of view that this can indeed be done. In the case of charge, for example, classical properties emerge through the interaction of a charged particle with electromagnetic fields.

One of the central aspects of this point of view, namely the fact that superselection rules can be physically interpreted not in an absolute sense, but only with respect to a “reference frame” (the coupling to an appropriate “measurement device”), was understood long ago [6, 7, 8]. There it was pointed out that existing proofs for superselection rules could not only be applied to operators generating ‘internal’ symmetries (such as charge), but also to those generating ‘external’ symmetries (such as [angular] momentum). They should therefore be treated symmetrically, leading to the apparently wrong result that superselection rules should exist for all locally conserved quantities. But for generators of external symmetries, like momentum, the flaw in this proof is not difficult to detect. While formally correct, it only refers to the momentum of the *whole* system, including the measurement apparatus, with respect to an absolute frame. The relevant quantity is, however, the momentum *relative* to the reference frame defined by the apparatus. This essential misidentification thus renders the (formally correct) proof physically irrelevant. The idea put forward in the references cited above is that this criticism essentially applies to all such ‘proofs’, and that consequently there cannot exist any exact superselection rules. Two further important aspects were, however, neglected in these early considerations: First, due to the validity of constraint equations such as Gauss’ law, quantum operators such as the electric charge operator acquire a different status in the theory than,

say, angular momentum. (This difference largely disappears, however, if angular momentum is treated within general relativity, since there the momentum constraints are analogous to Gauss' law, see below.) Second, the strong effect of the environment, for example the electromagnetic field in the case of charges, was not taken into account. In fact, in [6] only bare charges were considered, although the authors clearly remarked that only a detailed study of the available interactions could show whether one could indeed maintain quantum coherence. In the present investigation we thus focus our attention on these two aspects.

We start by exploring the significance of symmetries in the discussion of superselection rules. It will be appropriate to make first some general remarks and then address specific examples such as the charge superselection rule.

How do we describe symmetries in a physical theory? Let us assume that we are given a (classical) configuration space  $Q$ . We call it symmetric under a group  $K$  if  $k(q) \in Q$  for all  $k \in K$  and  $q \in Q$ . Quantum mechanically, it gives rise to the existence of symmetry eigenstates, for example in the form of superpositions

$$|\Psi_I^M\rangle = \sum_K c_K \int dk D_I^{MK}(k) U(k) |q\rangle \quad (1)$$

of all states  $U(k)|q\rangle = |k(q)\rangle$  with matrix representations (Wigner coefficients)  $D(k)$  and unitary representations  $U(k)$  on Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . It is assumed that the “formal states” (that is, points in the classical phase space,  $P$ , or rays in  $\mathcal{H}$ ) label physical states in a faithful way in the sense that they correspond to different physical states. There are, of course, important kinematical symmetries, such as Galilei or Lorentz transformations, which act only on the state space – not separately on configuration space.

The theory is furthermore called *dynamically* symmetric with respect to the action of  $K$ , if a solution  $q(t)$  of the classical dynamical equations require that  $k(q(t))$  be also a solution. In the corresponding quantum theory, stationary solutions may then be constructed by means of symmetry eigenstates, since the Hamiltonian will commute with the generators of the symmetry.

In many cases of interest – and it is these cases we actually consider here – one is given a larger “configuration space”  $\bar{Q}$  on which the physical configurations are labeled in a redundant fashion. The true configuration space is then obtained by identifying points via the action of some group  $G$ , which we call the *redundancy* group of the theory. Because of its interpretation,  $G$  must also define a *dynamical* invariance on this enlarged configuration space. Quantum mechanically one may formally introduce an enlarged Hilbert space by means of wave functionals defined on  $\bar{Q}$ , although the superposition principle (understood to apply to *physical* states) does not require the resulting formal states to represent physically new states in this case. The formal degrees of freedom are in fact immediately eliminated again by imposing a “constraint” that admits only superpositions which are symmetric under the action of the redundancy group.

All gauge theories exhibit this structure, where the group of gauge transformations acts on  $\bar{Q}$ . Specific examples are Yang-Mills theories, where the configuration space  $\bar{Q}$  is the space of gauge potentials, and general relativity, where it

is given by the space of three-metrics (with the coordinate freedom still present). In these nontrivial examples it proves extremely difficult to eliminate the redundancies explicitly and find a parametrisation of the proper state space,  $S$ . One therefore has to work with an enlarged state space,  $\bar{S}$ . In the corresponding quantum field theories, a member of  $\bar{S}$  may be thought of as a wave functional (or ray in Hilbert space) on the space of gauge potentials, or the three-metrics, while a member of  $S$  is a wave functional (or ray) on the space of gauge-invariant quantities, such as the magnetic field in QED, or the three-geometry in quantum gravity.

Such redundancies should not be confused with proper physical symmetries as defined above. Their interpretation as well as their consequences are quite different. Given an action of a symmetry group  $K$  on  $S$ , we cannot expect it to be defined on  $\bar{S}$ . But what must happen is that the symmetries  $K$  and the redundancies  $G$  merge into a larger group,  $\bar{G}$ , which contains  $G$  as a normal subgroup so that the quotient  $\bar{G}/G$  is isomorphic to  $K$ . A special case is  $\bar{G} = G \times K$ , but this is an exception. The group  $\bar{G}$  also transforms solution curves to solution curves. To account for its hybrid character we simply call it the *invariance* group. Now, the problem encountered in gauge theories, or general relativity, is that we are given  $\bar{S}$  and  $\bar{G}$ , but not directly  $K$ . To find  $K$  one has to decide precisely what part  $G$  of  $\bar{G}$  corresponds to unobservable transformations. The constraint analyses of those theories only tell us that  $G$  *must* contain the group generated by the constraint equations (such as Gauss' law), which is generally strictly smaller than  $\bar{G}$ , the group of all gauge transformations. A certain freedom is thus left as to whether one should also regard the remaining transformations as redundancy transformations or rather as symmetries. This distinction becomes important for the discussion of the dynamical origin of superselection rules. These general remarks will now be explicitly discussed in the light of physically relevant examples.

We shall first discuss the case of QED and the charge superselection rule. (The formal extension to nonabelian theories is straightforward, although the possible presence of confinement renders part of the discussion irrelevant.) Here,  $\bar{Q}$  is the space of vector potentials (whose components shall be denoted by  $A_a$ ) and charged spinor fields over a three-dimensional manifold  $M$  (the  $t = \text{constant}$  slice), and  $\bar{G}$  is the group of all gauge transformations. Consider first the *classical* theory. If  $E^a$  (the components of the electric field strength) denotes the momentum conjugate to  $A_a$ , the phase space function

$$Q^\xi[E^a, A_a] = \int_M d^3x (E^a \partial_a \xi + \rho \xi) \quad (2)$$

(where  $\xi(\mathbf{x})$  is an arbitrary function and  $\rho$  is the charge density) generates an infinitesimal gauge transformation parametrised by  $\xi$  on arbitrary functions on phase space. Integration by parts yields

$$Q^\xi[E^a, A_a] = \int_{S_\infty} d\sigma n_a E^a \xi - \int_M d^3x \xi (\partial_a E^a - \rho), \quad (3)$$

where the surface integral is over  $S_\infty$ , the “sphere at infinity”, and  $n_a$  is the outward pointing normal. On the other hand, the Gauss constraint of electrodynamics reads

$$\mathcal{G} \equiv \partial_a E^a - \rho = 0. \quad (4)$$

One immediately recognises from (3) that the Gauss constraint generates *asymptotically trivial* gauge transformations, i.e., gauge transformations for which the surface integral in (3) vanishes. They form the members of our redundancy group  $G$ . One also recognises, however, that  $Q^\xi$  generates *additional* gauge transformations, for example those which possess a constant  $\xi$  at spatial infinity (which is sufficient for the finiteness of energy). If these additional, “global”, gauge transformations were considered as redundancies, one would exclude global states with nonvanishing overall electric charge.

This may in fact be a reasonable cosmological conclusion for quantum mechanically closed (spatially finite or infinite) universes which do not have an outside reference frame, but it appears inappropriate for systems that in principle can interact with an outside world. In this sense  $S_\infty$  is meant to be a boundary *in* rather than *of* the physical universe. It acts like a reference system with respect to which the conserved quantities of the system under study are defined. This means that it may also act as a reservoir for these quantities, just like a material spatial reference system acts as a reservoir for (angular) momentum or a charge capacitor as a reference system for the conjugate phase [6]. It is clear that for this to make sense the system under study must necessarily share dynamical correlations with the reference frame, that is with physical systems outside  $S_\infty$ . We stress the relevance of this point for our understanding of so-called asymptotically isolated configurations in field theory. Here, in the mathematical description, one indeed takes the limit where the radius of  $S_\infty$  goes to infinity. But this is clearly nothing more than an idealisation that serves to conveniently replace boundary conditions by falloff conditions. These configurations are usually not meant as models of the universe!

Since we interpret  $S_\infty$  as representing a surface *within* the physical universe, we shall here regard global gauge transformations as physically meaningful *symmetries*. We note that  $Q^\xi$  commutes with  $\mathcal{G}$  on the constraint surface, and possesses the value

$$Q^\xi|_{\mathcal{G}=0} = \xi \int_{S_\infty} d\sigma n_a E^a \equiv \xi Q, \quad (5)$$

where

$$Q = \int_{S_\infty} d\sigma n_a E^a = \int_M d^3x \rho \quad (6)$$

is the total electric charge, which is conserved in time, since a flow through  $S_\infty$  is here excluded. It is an observable in the formal sense, since it commutes with  $\mathcal{G}$  on the constraint surface.

In the quantum theory the above relations remain formally valid as operator equations. The charge  $\rho$  is then given by  $-ie\pi_\psi\psi$ , where  $\psi$  is the spinor field, and  $\pi_\psi$  its conjugate momentum. If quantisation is performed in the functional Schrödinger picture [9], the constraint (4) is implemented as a restriction on

physically allowed wave functionals,  $\Psi[A_a, \psi]$ , as

$$\partial_a \frac{1}{i} \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta A_a} = -ie\psi \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta \psi}. \quad (7)$$

This equation expresses the simultaneous invariance of the wave functional with respect to local gauge transformations of the vector potential and the spinor field. The wave functional (*if* in a charge eigenstate) acquires, however, a phase if the electric charge operator (6) is applied:

$$e^{i\hat{Q}}\Psi = e^{ie\xi_\infty}\Psi. \quad (8)$$

Superpositions of states with different charges thus acquire a relative phase which involves the value of  $\xi$  on  $S_\infty$ .

It is important to note that the total charge within  $S_\infty$  *commutes* with all (quasi) local observables, i.e. observables which are restricted to subsystems within and suitably bounded away from  $S_\infty$  [2]<sup>2</sup>. The “state”  $\Psi$  in Eq. (8) has therefore to be understood cosmologically as the decohered *component* of an assumed “island universe” (which has no sources outside). This implies an alternative formulation of superselection rules, namely that superpositions of different charge, albeit not forbidden, are indistinguishable from mixed states *with respect to* the chosen class of observables [10]. In the algebraic approach to quantum field theory such a class of observables is introduced from the outset as a “reasonable choice”. Whereas this might be a formally consistent procedure, it seems too rigid to accomodate for a physical explanation of superselection rules, which at least in some cases (but probably all cases) we believe to be of an approximate nature only. The a priori choice of local observables might not necessarily be so “reasonable” once our interpretation of  $S_\infty$  as a boundary *within* the physical universe is recalled. On the other hand, insisting on the limit where  $S_\infty$  is strictly infinitely far away, one is left with no range of operational applicability.

Superpositions of different charge states can be distinguished from a corresponding mixture if a non-commuting variable is available at “spatial infinity”. This prevents the charge to lie in the centre of the algebra of the chosen observables. As can be seen from (6), this would necessarily involve the vector potential at spatial infinity. An example is the Mandelstam variable

$$\exp\left(ie \int_{-\infty}^x \mathbf{A} ds\right), \quad (9)$$

where the integration goes over an arbitrary path coming from “infinity” to the end point  $\mathbf{x}$ . It has non-vanishing matrix elements between different charge sectors. If the invariance with respect to “global” gauge transformations is interpreted as a symmetry, and not as a redundancy, this variable must correspond to

---

<sup>2</sup>The main part of [2] is concerned with the demonstration that the naive calculation of this result with the help of the above equations is also valid in local, covariant gauges, which is necessary to apply the Haag-Kastler formalism of algebraic field theory.

an observable. It is of course a physical question whether such operators are practically available and whether such phases at “infinity” can actually be measured, i.e. whether a reference system at such large distances can be assumed to exist. (For comparison, in the Kaluza-Klein approach to electric charge, this would correspond to the measurability of the intrinsic scale of the fifth dimension.)

One can, however, envisage an effective mechanism that prevents us from seeing such superpositions of charge states. Because of Gauss’ law, Coulomb fields carry information about the charge *at any distance*, thereby decohering a superposition of different charges in any *bounded* subsystem of an infinite universe. This “instantaneous” action of decoherence at an arbitrary distance by means of the Coulomb field gives it the appearance of a kinematical effect, while it is in fact based on the dynamical law of charge conservation. Such a time-independent charge must then always have been “measured” by the asymptotic field and thus has always been “decohered”. We emphasise that it was important above that charge is measurable by putting the sphere  $S_\infty$  at any distance on  $t = \text{constant}$  which is sufficiently far away. If Gauss’ law did not hold (and thus no Coulomb fields did exist), this would not be possible since one would then only have radiation fields which propagate along the future light cone.

We also note that there is an interesting connection between the degrees of freedom at infinity (corresponding to the directions of symmetry discussed above) and the infrared structure of the theory, i.e. the rôle of “soft photons” [11]. In fact, the presence of these degrees of freedom determines the infrared structure and demands, in a scattering process, the presence of incident soft photons which in turn leads to the cancellation of infrared divergences in the transition element between in- and out-states.

The above considerations show that it is physically more relevant to consider *local* superpositions of charge states. Let us therefore consider a “universe” with charge  $Q$ ,

$$|\Psi\rangle = \int dq f(q) |q\rangle \otimes |Q - q\rangle \quad (10)$$

– either the closed Universe with  $Q = 0$ , or an island universe that is decohered by its Coulomb field. Eq. (10) is an eigenstate of the charge operator for the total system, with eigenvalue  $Q$ , but where the respective subsystems are not in charge eigenstates. Of course, a global gauge transformation does no longer lead to different phases for the various components of such a state, but only to one global phase factor as in (8). Consequently, one does not have to invoke a non-commuting variable at “infinity” like (9) to verify this superposition. An example of such a “local superposition” can be found in the BCS state of superconductivity,

$$\psi_{BCS} = \prod_k \left( 1 + v(k) a_k^\dagger a_{-k}^\dagger \right) |0\rangle.$$

The *relative* phases of two superconductors (contained in  $v(k)$ ) can even be measured in Josephson junctions.

States like (10) have in fact been considered in [6] and [7]. The formal analogy of this state with one that refers to angular momentum instead of charge

led these authors to the conclusion that local superpositions of charges should be observable precisely as local superpositions of angular momenta. While this is true in principle, this argument should be completed by the observation (which is important quantitatively) that charged particles interact very efficiently with electromagnetic fields, leading to decoherence of the local superposition [12]. We do indeed seem to have an effective mechanism that prevents charge superpositions from being found: For example, thermal radiation interacts with charged particles through Thomson scattering and leads to strong decoherence within a few seconds [13]. Even more efficient seems to be the interaction of, say, an electron with its own radiation field. Ford has estimated the diminishing influence of this field on the height of amplitudes in an interference fringe and was able to distinguish the separate decoherence effects resulting from vacuum fluctuations and photon emission, respectively [14]. Using the Feynman-Vernon influence functional method, Barone and Caldeira calculated the decoherence factor,  $D(t)$ , for the interference between two electronic wave packets [15]. They found, using appropriate approximations, that  $D(t)$  approaches a time-independent constant for times larger than about  $10^{-24} \text{ sec}$  and that it does not lead to any decoherence effect for electrons in a solid where the interatomic spacing is of the order of angstroms. We mention that both calculations ([14] and [15]) treat the electron non-relativistically. In addition to the fine structure constant,  $D$  contains a cutoff in the number of field modes, which is assumed to be given roughly by the inverse de Broglie wavelength of the electron. One can, however, easily derive from [15] that decoherence must be very efficient if the electronic wave packets are separated more than about ten Å. This seems to be in conflict with experiment, since effects of coherent wave packets have been observed over a distance of about 4600 Å [16]. This is, of course, still many orders of magnitude below the values which can be attained for neutral particles such as neutrons. One must, however, keep in mind that the cutoff in the number of modes (which was merely guessed) enters the exponent of  $D$  quadratically and may well be lower than the value given in Ref. [15]. Only a full QED calculation, which as yet is elusive, would settle this question. Such a calculation would have to make use of the exact master equation for an electron obtained by tracing out its radiation field [17].

There exist many situations in which decoherence must be expected to be effective. For example, the superposition principle requires the existence of quantum states containing macroscopically different electromagnetic fields. Such superpositions are in fact described by a general wave functional of QED as it was assumed in (7). Any sufficiently narrow wave packet for a charged particle feeling different Lorentzian forces from these different fields would then immediately split into separate components depending on (and being correlated with) them. The particle can thus be said to “measure” the state of the field. Since there are always charged particles around, no interference effects between macroscopically different fields can ever be observed. A QED calculation has shown, for example, that the superposition of two different electric fields rapidly decoheres if the field values are not too small [18]. The field therefore *seems to be* in one of its classical states with the corresponding probability.



If it were possible to spatially separate a charge from its anti-charge in order to recombine them later on, it would only be due to the irreversible “measurements” by the field that “information” about their temporary separation (that is, about their dipole moment and higher moments) remained present in the Universe. In particular, the components of a globally neutral superposition such as

$$\phi_+(1)\phi_-(2) + e^{i\alpha}\phi_-(1)\phi_+(2),$$

with spatially separated states 1 and 2, would *remain* decohered if they were brought together. (This example emphasises the responsibility of the arrow of time, which is present in the retarded nature of decoherence for the historical appearance of our world.)

Thus, although charge is *always* decohered in the subsystems of a state like (10) (as for any conserved additive quantity [8]), the important question is whether these subsystems can be coherently brought together again after having been spatially separated. Decoherence due to Coulomb fields is reversible, while the influence of radiation fields (“escaping photons”) is irreversible and leads to an upper bound for the coherent separation of charge pairs.

If one succeeded in reversibly preparing the above  $\alpha$ -dependent superposition, one could also “measure” the charge of the state  $\phi(1)$  *microscopically*, e.g., by means of an interaction with a spinor field  $\chi$ :

$$\phi_{\pm}(1)\chi_0 \rightarrow \phi_{\pm}(1)\chi_{\pm},$$

where  $\chi_{\pm}$  indicates charge *dependence* of the final state – not charge itself. After recombination of the charges one would be left with an observable superposition

$$\phi_{neutral}(\chi_+ + e^{i\alpha}\chi_-)$$

and would thus have verified the existence of the above superposition.

We also note that, interestingly, decoherence is able to distinguish between action-at-a-distance theories (like the absorber theory by Wheeler and Feynman) and local field theories: In the former case decoherence would only be achieved after absorption has taken place, i.e., usually much later than in the latter case.

Our second example for the connection of symmetries and superselection rules is concerned with the total mass of a system. In the case of many nonrelativistic particles with a Galilei invariant interaction potential, a superselection rule for the total mass follows immediately from the fact that the relevant action of the Galilei group on state space is given by some nontrivial ray representations which are inequivalent for different total mass parameters. For a detailed exposition see e.g. Ref. [19]. In physical terms, this corresponds to the unobservability of an overall phase of the wave function, which is the variable conjugate to the “mass operator”. In our language, the mass operator generates a redundancy transformation. The situation is different in general relativity where mass is equivalent to energy, and the conjugate variable may be interpreted as a clock variable (i.e., as “time”). The question about possible superpositions of, say,

different masses of Schwarzschild black holes is thus equivalent to the question of the observability of clock variables at spatial “infinity”.

In order to describe the situation properly we consider, in analogy to the field theoretic case above, the formulation of canonical general relativity for asymptotically isolated systems. Recall that in general relativity the canonical variables are  $(h_{ab}, \pi^{ab})$ , where  $h_{ab}$  is the Riemannian metric on a three-dimensional manifold  $M$  which in the spacetime picture corresponds to a spacelike slice. The conjugate momentum,  $\pi^{ab}$ , is in the spacetime picture essentially given by the extrinsic curvature. The asymptotic conditions characterising isolated systems imply the existence of an *asymptotic coordinate system* where the metric approaches  $\delta_{ab}$  plus terms of the order  $1/r$ . The phase space functional

$$D^\xi[h_{ab}, \pi^{ab}] \equiv \int_M d^3x \left( 2\pi^{ab} \nabla_a \xi_b + T^{nb} \xi_b \right) \quad (11)$$

(where  $T^{nb}$  denotes the corresponding components of the energy momentum tensor with  $n$  denoting the normal component) generates infinitesimal diffeomorphisms. As in the case of charge we perform an integration by parts,

$$D^\xi = 2 \int_{S_\infty} d\sigma \pi^{ab} n_a \xi_b - \int_M \left( 2\nabla_a \pi^{ab} - T^{nb} \right) \xi_b d^3x. \quad (12)$$

On the other hand, the diffeomorphism constraints are given by (note the analogy to Gauss’ law (4))

$$\mathcal{C} \equiv 2\nabla_a \pi^{ab} - T^{nb} = 0, \quad (13)$$

and are seen from (12) to generate the connected component of asymptotically trivial diffeomorphisms (for which the surface integral in (12) vanishes). This will represent our redundancy group  $G$ . In quantum gravity the constraint (13) is implemented as a constraint on wave functionals and implies that this functional does not change with respect to this kind of diffeomorphisms. It can, however, acquire a phase by an asymptotically nontrivial diffeomorphism, or a diffeomorphism that is not connected with the identity (giving rise to  $\theta$ -states, see e.g. [20], [21]). The configuration space  $\bar{Q}$  is now given by the space of these metrics on  $M$ , while  $\bar{G}$  is the whole group of diffeomorphisms of  $M$  which preserve the asymptotic structure for the metric. The symmetry group  $K = \bar{G}/G$  thus still contains those diffeomorphisms that preserve the asymptotic form for the metric, that is, the euclidean group of translations and rotations. In the case of rotations, for example, one finds

$$D^\xi|_{\mathcal{C}=0} = \omega^a J_a, \quad (14)$$

where  $\omega^a$  and  $J_a$  are the components of angular velocity and angular momentum, respectively. This is the analogous expression to (5). A similar expression follows for the total momentum. Thus, in general relativity, total momentum and angular momentum are expressible as asymptotic charges which are determined by surface integrals over arbitrarily large spheres. Again, these charges commute with the diffeomorphism constraint and thus correspond to formal observables.

The question whether these charges are observables is connected with the question about the physical realisability of the asymptotic coordinate system. It

is plausible that a rotation with respect to some “absolute space” is meaningless and thus defined only with respect to some *physically* defined asymptotic space. (This, of course, is reminiscent of Mach’s criticism of Newtonian space concepts.) Superpositions of different angular momenta are then possible and no superselection rule holds for them. Note that there are well known solutions with non-vanishing asymptotic charges, most notably the Kerr black hole. If no physically defined asymptotic space were available, only states with vanishing angular momentum would be allowed. This feature is already present in purely relational and reparametrisation invariant theories of nonrelativistic mechanics [22].

A discussion of a superselection rule for mass in general relativity has to address the rôle of energy. General relativity contains, in addition to the diffeomorphism constraint (11), a Hamiltonian constraint which classically generates reparametrisations in time. In the asymptotically flat case it contains the total energy of the system as a surface integral at “infinity”,

$$E = \frac{1}{16\pi G} \int_{S_\infty} d\sigma n_a (h_{ab,b} - h_{bb,a}), \quad (15)$$

and the momentum conjugate to a clock variable at “infinity” [23]. One may then, as in Eq. (1), construct a superposition of all possible pointer positions of this clock, arriving in this way at an energy eigenstate. The unobservability of this “global time” would immediately lead to a superselection rule for the energy [24], in the same way as the unobservability of a global phase would lead to a superselection rule for the total charge. In analogy to (10), time emerges intrinsically in the form of correlations between subsystems such as clocks [24, 25]. If the Universe is closed, the clock variable at infinity is absent, since no “outside region” is available as a reference system.

We also note an interesting analogy between the Coulomb potential and the lapse function. In the four dimensional picture with Newtonian approximation, the square of the lapse function becomes  $1 + 2U$ , where  $U$  is the Newtonian potential. Like the Coulomb potential, it is determined after gauge fixing by an elliptic equation and thus propagates “instantaneously” to infinity. This explains why the energy in (15) is given by a surface integral, in analogy to the charge (6).

The analogy between charge and angular momentum etc. is, however, not complete. In the case of charge it is the global eigenvalue that decoheres. In the case of translations, the variable conjugate to momentum, namely position, becomes “classical” in this sense, while the nonabelian character of rotations leads to the classical orientation of the rotation axis (see [25]).

For local superpositions of macroscopic masses, decoherence should occur through interaction with the gravitational field as well as with matter fields. As far as the interaction with retarded fields is concerned, one has to take into account the small interaction strength. (One would expect a factor  $Gm^2/5c^5$  instead of  $2e^2/3c^3$  to occur in the decoherence factor of [15]). Matter, however, “measures” the geometry very efficiently [18].

We finally emphasise that we expect other examples to fit into this scheme

as well. One example is provided by “large” gauge transformations and their associated  $\theta$ - states [21]. In QCD, superpositions would lead to superpositions of neutron states with a different electric dipole moment. One would again expect that the interaction with electromagnetic fields would decohere this superposition.

*Note added:* After completion of this work the preprint “Conservation Laws in the Quantum Mechanics of Closed Systems”, by J. B. Hartle, R. Laflamme, and D. Marolf, has appeared on the bulletin board (gr-qc/9410006). It discusses the connection of superselection rules and symmetries in the framework of consistent histories. Their result, that decoherence is exact as a consequence of the coupling to long-range fields, corresponds to our case where the spheres in the integrations of (3) and (12) lie *strictly* at infinity, thus leading to an exact superselection rule.

### Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Heinz-Dieter Conradi, Erich Joos, Joachim Kupsch and Ion-Olimpiu Stamatescu for many stimulating discussions and critical comments. We also thank the FESr for support.

### References

- [1] G. C. Wick, A. S. Wightman, and E. P. Wigner, Phys. Rev. **88**, 101 (1952).
- [2] F. Strocchi and A. S. Wightman, Journ. Math. Phys. **15**, 2198 (1974).
- [3] R. Haag, *Local quantum physics*, Springer, Berlin, 1992;  
S. S. Horuzhy, *Introduction to Algebraic Quantum Field Theory*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1990.
- [4] H. D. Zeh, Found. Phys. **1**, 69 (1970); Phys. Lett. A **172**, 189 (1993).
- [5] W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 1516 (1981).
- [6] Y. Aharonov and L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. **155**, 1428 (1967).
- [7] R. Mirman, Phys. Rev. D **1**, 3349 (1970).
- [8] E. Lubkin, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **56**, 69 (1970).
- [9] R. Jackiw, in *Field Theory and Particle Physics*, edited by O. Eboli, M. Gomes, and A. Santano (World Scientific, Singapore, 1988); C. Kiefer and A. Wipf, *Functional Schrödinger equation for fermions in external gauge fields*, to appear in Annals of Physics.
- [10] N. P. Landsman, Int. Journ. Mod. Phys. A **6**, 5349 (1991).
- [11] J.-L. Gervais and D. Zwanziger, Phys. Lett. B **94**, 389 (1980).
- [12] O. Kübler and H. D. Zeh, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **76**, 405 (1973).

- [13] E. Joos and H. D. Zeh, Z. Phys. B **59**, 223 (1985).
- [14] L. H. Ford, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 5571 (1993).
- [15] P. Barone and A. Caldeira, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 57 (1991).
- [16] H. Schmid, in *Proceedings of the 8th European Congress on Electron Microscopy*, edited by A. Csanády et al. (Program Committee, Budapest, 1984).
- [17] L. Diósi, Found. Phys. **20**, 63 (1990).
- [18] C. Kiefer, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 1658 (1992).
- [19] D. Giulini, E. Joos, C. Kiefer, J. Kupsch, I.-O. Stamatescu, and H. D. Zeh, *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory*, Chapter V (in preparation).
- [20] C. J. Isham, Phys. Lett. B **106**, 188 (1981).
- [21] C. Kiefer, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 5414 (1993).
- [22] J. B. Barbour and B. Bertotti, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **382**, 295 (1982).
- [23] T. Regge and C. Teitelboim, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **88**, 286 (1974).
- [24] D. N. Page and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. D **27**, 2885 (1983).
- [25] H. D. Zeh, in *Stochastic evolution of quantum states in open systems and measurement processes*, edited by L. Diósi and B. Lucacz (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994).